

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5 are the claims currently pending in the Application. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 5 to more clearly recite the invention. No new matter has been added. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369 and further in view of Katsikas, U.S. Patent 6,868,498. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Robertson discloses a personal contact manager system, which features a relational database built from a set of relational tables. A first user must execute a GUI to specify which types of data fields a specific second user can view (abstract, column 4, lines 46-48, column 8, lines 12-14, FIG. 9). Robertson does not disclose whether the first user communicated by electronic mail with the second user. In addition, the Examiner states that Robertson fails to teach identifying information for a recipient of an electronic mail sent by the user to a personal information storer.

By contrast, the present invention provides a requester or second user with first user's personal information if the first user has previously communicated with the requester via electronic mail. As claims 1 and 5 recite, the system uses identifying information, which is created when the first user sends an electronic mail to a recipient or second user. Claims 1 and 5 also recite storing identifying information for a recipient of an electronic mail. Thus the present invention offers a straightforward solution to the problem of providing personal information only to a requester with whom a user has communicated by electronic mail, as opposed to the complex relational data sharing system disclosed by Robertson.

Katsikas has a U.S. filing date of August 25, 2000. In applicant's response filed April 6, 2005, and received April 12, 2005, a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 together with Exhibits was submitted. As evidenced by this Declaration, the present invention was made and reduced to practice prior to June 13, 2000, which is prior to August 25, 2000. Therefore, Katsikas should now be removed as a reference cited against the present Application.

Thus the prior art does not teach or suggest all of the features of the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, the applicant wishes to correct the record in that the amendment filed April 6, 2005, and received in the US PTO on April 12, 2005, incorrectly stated that the invention was disclosed prior to June 13, 2002. The Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 relied upon in this April 2005 amendment does not state that the invention was disclosed prior to June 13, 2002. In fact, the Declaration states that the invention was made and reduced to practice prior to June 13, 2000 (see Declaration, page 1, paragraph number 3).

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

KRV/kd